

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action of June 13, 2006 has been carefully reviewed, and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 11-14, 16-18, and 20-22 are allowed. By this amendment, claims 1 and 23 are cancelled, new independent claim 24 is added, and claims 3-9 are amended. Claims 21 and 22 also are amended to correct minor errors therein. No new matter is raised by these amendments to the claims, and entry thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 3-9, 11-14, 16-18, and 20-24 are thus pending following entry of the amendments to the claims herein.

#### **Claims 1, 3-9, and 23**

Claims 1, 3-9, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,801,747 Bedard in view of EP 1 091 581 A2 Smith, U.S. Patent 5,610,653 Abecassis, and U.S. Patent 6,701,523 Hancock. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have cancelled claims 1 and 23, have added new independent claim 24, and changed the dependency of claims 3-9 from claim 1 to claim 24. In addition, claims 3-9 have further been amended to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. It is respectfully submitted that none of Bedard, Smith, Abecassis, or Hancock, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claims 3-9 or 24 as amended herein.

New claim 24 describes a system for generating a list of suggested television programs that makes use of program characteristics of scheduled television programs and relevancy factors given to those characteristics, wherein a program characteristic is given a characteristic's weight in a user profile. New claim 24 further recites that a characteristic's weight for a program characteristic in the user profile is periodically incremented, wherein an incremented weight for a characteristic "is equal to a number of time periods the first television program is watched by the user times a previous weight given to said first program characteristic times the first relevancy factor for said first program characteristic."

It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests incrementing a weight for a program characteristic

as recited in claim 24. Bedard discloses a viewer profile with information regarding the channels and programming watched by a viewer, wherein weights given to categories of programming in a viewer profile are periodically incremented. However, in Bedard, the characteristic weights of programming watched by a user are based merely on the time (i.e., number of viewing units) spent watching programming with a particular category or subcategory. Bedard does not disclose or suggest “incrementing a weight for said first program characteristic in the user profile, wherein an incremented weight for said first program characteristic is equal to a number of time periods the first television program is watched by the user times a previous weight given to said first program characteristic times the first relevancy factor for said first program characteristic” as recited in claim 24.

None of Smith, Abecassis, or Hancock can overcome this deficiency in Bedard. Smith discloses displaying television listings for a future time period, but does not disclose or suggest using characteristic weights or incrementing characteristic weights to generate a listing as in claim 24. Abecassis discloses providing customized content-on-demand based on user preferences, but does not disclose or suggest incrementing characteristic weights in the manner described in claim 24. Hancock merely teaches the use of multiple user selectable modes for display of the television program guide. Thus, the combination of Bedard with Smith, Abecassis, and Hancock does not disclose or suggest a system for generating a list of suggested television programs as described in claim 24, and allowance of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Claim 24 being allowable over the prior art of record, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 3-9 are also allowable in view of their dependency from claim 24 and further in view of the additional inventive steps recited therein. Applicants note that the capitalized terms “Topic,” “Theme,” and/or “Topic\_Theme” used to refer to program characteristics in claims 3 and 7, as well as in claims 21 and 22, are used for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to be limited to any particular form of topic, theme, or combination of topic and theme.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 3-9 and 24 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the invention as claimed herein. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-9, 11-14, 16-18, 20-23, and 24 are allowable over the cited prior art, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees required by this amendment or credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,  
C. Wang et al.

Date: Aug 10, 2006

By: Catherine A. Ferguson  
Catherine A. Ferguson  
Reg. No. 40,877  
(609) 734-6440

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing, Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-0028